

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	13/02/2018
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	12/01/2018
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Lisa McCann			2017/6709/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
4 Court Close St John's Wood Park London NW8 6NN			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a single storey rear extension and single storey rear conservatory, creation of roof terrace and installation of glass balustrade and 1.8m high screening panel at first floor level adjacent to terrace.				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission		
Application Type:		Householder Application		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice displayed 22/12/2017 (expired 12/01/2018) No responses received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	No responses received					

Site Description

The site is located on Court Close, St John's Wood Park, and forms part of an end of terrace house of 4 x 3 storey dwellinghouses. The site is located in a large housing estate with tower blocks of flats interspersed with terraced houses. The site is not within a conservation area.

Relevant History

2017/4283/P - Proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to include single storey rear conservatory extension, roof terrace and installation of screening panel adjacent to terrace. – Granted 17.11.2017

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Supplementary Planning Policies

CPG1: Design

CPG6: Amenity

1 Proposal

- 1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension which would project a depth of 3.8m from the original rear elevation of the subject property, measuring a maximum height of 3.1m with a flat roof. A conservatory extension is also proposed which would project a further 3.4m in depth from the proposed extension (7.2m depth in total), with a pitched roof measuring 2.7m at the eaves. The proposed single storey extension would extend the full width of the host dwelling and the proposed conservatory element would measure a width of 5.9m. The plans indicate that this element of the proposal would project out beyond the side/rear elevation building line of the subject property. A roof terrace and glass balustrade with 1.8m screening panel is also proposed at first floor level on the roof of the proposed single storey extension only (excluding the conservatory).
- 1.2 Planning permission was recently granted under application reference 2017/4283/P (see history section) for a single storey rear extension to include a single storey rear extension and conservatory, roof terrace and installation of a screening panel adjacent to the terrace. The main differences between the previously approved application and the current proposal is the size and siting of the proposed conservatory. The previously approved scheme granted under planning reference 2017/4283/P included a conservatory which measured a width of 3.8m and was sited in line with the rear elevation building line of the host dwelling. The current proposal has increased the width of this conservatory element to 5.9m which extends further west and would project beyond the side/ rear elevation building line of the host dwelling. The approved metal railings enclosing the first floor terrace area would be revised to install a structural glass balustrade.

2 Amendments

- 2.1 The applicant was advised during the course of the application that there were concerns with the proposed conservatory element of the proposal for the reasons outlined in the design section below. The applicant submitted revised plans which did not address the issues regarding the size and siting of the proposed conservatory element and were not accepted as formal revisions to the original plans submitted.

3 Assessment

- 3.1 The main consideration for the purposes of this application are the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and impacts upon the residential amenity of neighbouring residents.

Design

- 3.2 The following considerations contained within policy D1 'Design' of the Camden Local Plan 2017 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings.
- 3.3 Paragraph 3.7 of CPG1 states: "Rear extensions should be designed to: be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing".
- 3.4 The combined depth of the proposed extensions would result in the extensions measuring a maximum depth of 7.2m. Within the estate there are a number of planning permissions that have been granted for double extensions like this one to properties that are within a terrace of two storey houses. These include 1 Court Close under 2013/8175/P (7m deep extension) and

3 Court Close (planning reference: 2010/6014/P) (7.2m deep extension). Whilst these neighbouring properties are not directly adjoining to the subject property, they are within the same estate and are of a similar design and layout to the subject property. Their site context and planning history is therefore taken into consideration as part of this assessment. The depth of the extension is considered acceptable given the character and nature of the neighbouring properties (albeit not part of this row) and also taking account of the recently approved permission in November 2017 (see planning history above).

- 3.5 The previously granted proposal for the subject property under reference 2017/4283/P was considered to appear subordinate in scale to the host building. The approved conservatory measured approx. half the width of the original dwellinghouse, which reduced the overall scale of the extensions and this was considered subordinate to the main dwellinghouse. It was considered that the previous proposal approved under reference 2017/4283/P was at its maximum size to still remain subordinate to the main house. As part of this current application the conservatory has increased in size due to its increased width that would result in the conservatory extending further west beyond the side/ rear elevation building line of the host dwelling. It is considered that the increased size and excessive width of the proposed conservatory would result in a prominent and bulky addition which would not respect the scale and character of the original property. The combined size and scale of the extensions would be considered significantly greater than the existing and would have an increased harmful cumulative impact on the character of the host property which could not be supported. There is no other similar form of development in the surrounding area which would justify the proposed siting of the conservatory and its extended size beyond the original building line and is considered to be unsympathetic to the character of the row of which the application property forms a part.
- 3.6 At first floor level, a glass balustrade terrace boundary treatment is proposed. The proposed structural glass material is considered to be out of keeping with the character of the area as other neighbouring properties within this terrace row (no 6 and 7 Court Close) currently have metal railing terrace boundary treatments. The previously proposed railings to match the existing materials under planning reference 2017/4283/P was considered to be more sympathetic to the existing site context and could be supported. However in this instance, the proposed structural glass material is considered to be inappropriate, failing to respect the existing site context and neighboring development. It would therefore result in a detrimental impact on the character of the host property and surrounding area and cannot be supported.
- 3.7 Overall, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would not be subordinate to the host building nor would it respect or preserve the original proportions, materials or design of the building. The cumulative impact of the proposed development is considered to appear as a dominant and incongruous addition which would not respect the character of the original property or surrounding area and cannot be supported.
- 3.8 As such, the proposal is considered to harm the appearance of the host building and surrounding area and would be contrary to policies A1 and D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Camden Planning Guidance.

Amenity

- 3.9 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

- 3.10 The subject property is set further south than the neighbouring residential block at Boydell Court to the west. Due to the siting and orientation of Boydell Court, the impact of the proposed extension would not be significantly different or more harmful than the existing situation.
- 3.11 The subject property has an existing full width balcony area enclosed by railings as it leads out from first floor level. The proposed balcony area will be approx. 1.2m deeper than the existing. Some overlooking would occur to neighbouring garden space, however, the proposed 1.8m screening panel (only shown on the elevation drawing) along the shared boundary with no. 5 would help to mitigate this impact and overall the extent of overlooking would not be significantly different or more harmful than the existing situation. It must be noted that this element of the scheme remains unchanged from the previously approved scheme in 2017.
- 3.12 The proposed extension would project 3.8m along the shared boundary with no. 5. This element of the proposal is considered to have a generally modest projection along the shared boundary which would not give rise to any concerns regarding impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property no. 5. The proposed conservatory element of the extension would be set in 3m from the shared boundary with no. 5 which would further help to mitigate the impact on the residential amenity of this neighbouring property.
- 3.13 In respect of noise nuisance, the balcony would have the potential to fit a table and chairs, however, the door leading out to the balcony is from the master bedroom and not a kitchen or lounge which may decrease the likelihood of the balcony being used for entertainment purposes. It is not considered that the balcony will contribute to a significantly more harmful amount of noise generation than the existing situation.
- 3.14 For the above reasons, there are no concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

4 Recommendation:

Refuse Planning Permission

